



Wednesday, February 15, 2006

To: All Potential Bidders

RE: RFP 0806005S400 – Service Orientated Architecture

AMENDMENT ONE

- 1) Amend RFP Sections 1.1E; Summary of Events; 1.9 and 4.2A to change the due date for receipt of proposals from March 2 to March 3, 2006 at 3:00 PM CT.
- 2) Amend RFP Sections 1.3; 1.9; 4.0; 4.2A to change the required number of paper copies of the proposal from fifteen (15) copies to five (5) copies.
- 3) Amend the RFP to include the following answers to 52 timely received questions:

Q1: Is there someone we can talk to about the Unlimited Liability in this contract? Do you get a lot of vendors that respond to these with that clause? Is there any negotiation on the liability?

A: All questions regarding the RFP must be addressed only to the issuing officer and in writing. Questions shall pertain to the particular RFP and not to any other solicitation or procurement. Vendors are to respond to the RFP knowing that the unlimited liability clause is not negotiable.

Q2: Can you send me a soft copy of the presentation and attendance list?

A: See Attached.

Q3: How many people need to be trained at each level (Stakeholders / CIO - Technical / Architects - IT)?

A: There are 11 JCIO agencies that will be participating in the training to be delivered. Each agency will identify 2 technical representatives and up to 10 business representatives for training.

Q4: Can we have a list of vendors present at the conference that was held on Tuesday, February 7, 2006?

A: See Attached.

Q5: We would like to have a soft copy of this proposal in Microsoft Word so that we can copy/paste the tables to preserve formatting for the soft-copy version that is required in proposal submittal.

A: The PDF copy should allow highlight, copy and paste, but if you feel you really require a Word version it is available upon request to the issuing officer.

Q6: Can you indicate the number of people who would be trained on the software for this project so we can provide more accurate training cost numbers?

A: Refer to Q3 and sections 3.1.B.2.a and 3.1.B.3.c in the RFP.

- Q7: Would the training be done on site at your location?
- A: Yes.
- Q8: We [] would appreciate receiving any minutes from the bidders conference.
- A: The bidder's conference was not recorded in any way.
- Q9: RE: RFP Section 2.3: Ownership of Deliverables - It would be desired for a vendor to reuse their tools, templates, methodologies, etc. after this project. Could you please clarify the extent of ownership to Intellectual Property?
- A: We're interested in expanding the use of templates and methodology, not necessarily technical tools. Contractor shall own a) all of its pre-existing methods, techniques and processes, including software and documentation, that it brings to this engagement and shall own all enhancements to these methods, techniques and processes, including software and documentation, that are developed during the course of this engagement ("Contractor's Property") and (b) Contractor shall have the right to retain copies of all materials in its files evidencing its services for the State. Contractor agrees to grant the State a royalty-free, nonexclusive, nontransferable license to use, duplicate and disclose Contractor's Property for the purposes contemplated by the Agreement.
- Q10: RE: RFP Section 2.4: No Limitation of Liability - If multiple vendors take exception to the proposed "No Limitation of Liability" language in their proposals, will those vendors be considered out of compliance with the stated requirements of the RFP?
- A: Yes
- Q11: RE: RFP Section 2.4: No Limitation of Liability - Will the State consider revising portions of Section 2.4 so as to bring the proposed contract terms in line with industry standard contracting principles, for example: a. Including an exclusion of consequential, indirect, incidental, special, and exemplary damages but excepting from such exclusion damages arising from bad faith, fraud, willful or intentional misconduct and breach of confidentiality requirements? b. Include for industry standard warrant exceptions and exclusions?
- A: Vendors are to respond to the RFP knowing that the unlimited liability clause is not negotiable.
- Q12: RE: RFP Section 3.1.A.3.d and 3.1.B.1.f - Can the June 1, 2006 final delivery date be adjusted according to Contract Initiation date and the proposed Work Plan/Timeline?
- A: All deliverables must be received and accepted by the State not later than June 30, 2006.
- Q13: RE: RFP Section 3.1.A.3.d and 3.1.B.1.f - Will a proposal be rejected if multiple Work Plans are provided, according to delivery timeline, that do not address all RFP requirements (i.e. Contract Initiated May 1 vs. April 1 will not meet all deliverables described in RFP due to June 1, 2006 deadline)?
- A: Proposals that do not meet all RFP requirements will be rejected (see RFP section 4.2.B). See Q12 for the revised deadline.
- Q14: RE: RFP Section 3.1.A.5.b - Not knowing the amount of time proposal evaluation may take and that vendors cannot keep teams assembled indefinitely, is it acceptable for a vendor to specify how long the proposed team will remain available to the state prior to contract initiation (i.e. 30, 60, 90 days)?
- A: The State intends to execute a contract within 30 days of the proposal due date (3/2/2006).

- Q15: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.1.b - This section identifies an incorrect location of status report formats (3.1.A.3.k.1). Could you please specify the correct section number/location?
- A: 3.1.A.3.j.1 is the correct reference.
- Q16: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.1.d - This section allows the state to “impose more stringent requirements”, please clarify when these requirements can be expected within the project timeline.
- A: The section should read as follows: “Vendor’s Deliverables shall meet the State Enterprise Security Policy Guidelines and may impose more stringent requirements.”
- Q17: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.1.d - At which point in the project will imposing “more stringent requirements” be considered an increase in scope?
- A: The section should read as follows: “Vendor’s Deliverables shall meet the State Enterprise Security Policy Guidelines and may impose more stringent requirements.”
- Q18: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.1.d - Using the State Enterprise Security Policy Guidelines as minimum requirements, will any additional level of detail be left up to the vendor to provide along the course of the project?
- A: See Q16 above.
- Q19: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.1.e - Please explain the extent to the “data standard” expected. Do you intend to include formatting and rules? Please clarify.
- A: The State is looking for a vendor to provide appropriate recommendations.
- Q20: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.2.a - Could you provide the number of individuals you estimate to be trained broken out by “non IT and IT policy-level individuals, managers and administrators”?
- A: See Q3.
- Q21: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.a.1 - Please explain the intent of the “data model” delivery.
- A: The State requires the vendor to define the data model.
- Q22: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.a.1 - Do you wish the vendor to define a data model?
- A: See Q20.
- Q23: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.a.2 - The RFP included a list of agency applications and the extent to which they share data. Knowing this, what further “inventory” is required?
- A: The State has identified existing Web Services within the JCIO agencies. The vendor shall identify the data formats and business rules and other considerations necessary to complete the Proof of Concept Plan.
- Q24: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.a.2 - Will legal experts within the agencies assist with assembling the sharing rules?
- A: Yes, where appropriate.
- Q25: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.a.2 - To what extent are the sharing rules already documented?

- A: Limited, varies by agency and system.
- Q26: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.a.2 - To what extent can we expect local agency support in assembling / validating the rules?
- A: The vendor is required to assemble and validate the rules. The State may be able to provide limited assistance in these activities.
- Q27: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.a.2 - Please provide the number of applications with web services (the number of applications included in this requirement).
- A: See the updated Data Sharing Survey, attached.
- Q28: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.a.4.iii - The “potential use by others” reference makes this requirement sound like a risk assessment. Could you please clarify the intent of this requirement?
- A: This is not a risk assessment. The intent is that data will be available in a repository for sharing and use by other entities, with the explicit permission of the lawful custodian of the data. The vendor shall document potential users of that data.
- Q29: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.a.4.iii - Who is included in “others outside the lawful custodians of the data”?
- A: The JCIO agencies.
- Q30: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.a.4.iii - Without a solid understanding of each agency’s business, there will be difficulty in identifying other potential users. Will the state assist the vendor in identifying these potential users?
- A: See Q28.
- Q31: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.e.1 - Is there a particular technology stack you would like us to stick to when providing the list of interoperability solutions?
- A: No. See section 3.1.B.3.b.
- Q32: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.3.e.1 - Can the state provide an existing inventory of technologies used throughout the agencies?
- A: See the EIP study: <http://das.ite.iowa.gov/eip/>
- Q33: RE: RFP Section 3.1.B.4.c - Will this requirement be limited to identification only or do you require a future state and gap analysis?
- A: Yes. Provide identification and additional standards as appropriate.
- Q34: RE: RFP Section 5.0 - Is it possible for you to unlock the .PDF or post a Word .doc version of the RFP so that we might complete the Required Forms electronically?
- A: The PDF copy should allow highlight, copy and paste, but if you feel you really require a Word version it is available upon request to the issuing officer.
- Q35: Per the bidder's conference, BEA has done some front planning on the SOA RFP for the JCIO. Is this work public, and if so, can we get a copy of it?
- A: BEA has not been involved in any planning or discussion for this RFP.

- Q36: Since BEA has done some preliminary work on this, does this preclude them from bidding on this RFP?
- A: BEA is not precluded. See Q34.
- Q37: The State has indicated in the RFP on page 14 there is no limitation of liability and the 'foregoing is considered a material term and condition of the RFP not subject to negotiation or Vendor exception'. Will the State reconsider this position?
- A: The RFP explicitly states that any proposal taking exception to the no limitation of liability clause will be rejected and not evaluated. The RFP would have to be canceled and re-issued for that to change. We do not anticipate canceling the RFP.
- Q38: Does the contractor's proposal become Schedule A to the contract?
- A: Contract Schedule A in the contract will be negotiated and comprise of mutually agreed to elements from the RFP and Vendor's Proposal.
- Q39: Given the fixed target completion date, should the start be delayed materially by contract negotiations, will the State agree to proportional scope of effort reductions to the Statement of Work?
- A: No.
- Q40: Please identify the State's project manager for this initiative and the amount of time this person will allocate to the project on a weekly basis.
- A: At this time, the identity of the project manager and allocated time is not known.
- Q41: Given that the State expects to holdback 10% of all milestone payments, will the State commit to a set timeframe of calendar days for review and approval?
- A: All approved payments will be made no later than July 31, 2006.
- Q42: As noted on page 22, "Vendor shall, as directed by the SOA Technical Committee, evaluate various existing or proposed web services...". Since the committee will be assigning this activity, please indicate how many web services need to be considered for evaluation as part of this project for purposes of understanding the scope of work.
- A: See the amended inventory (Q26).
- Q43: Will the list of attendees be available on Thursday, February 9, 2006? Also, will it be distributed via e-mail or should I check the web site?
- A: See Attached.
- Q44: It was communicated during the vendor meeting that BEA recently completed an engagement relating to the State of Iowa's Service Oriented Architecture initiative. What was the scope of the engagement entered into with BEA regarding planning for a Service Oriented Architecture?
- A: See Q34 and Q35.
- Q45: How do we obtain a copy of the work delivered by BEA?
- A: See Q34 and Q35.

Q46: Is there a vendor on site who has already done SOA work for the State of Iowa? Is this RFP built upon previously completed RFPs?

A: No. No.

Q47: There is a distinction to be made between SOA and web services. An SOA may be developed independent of any specific technology. Is it the intent of the State of Iowa to constrain the architecture of the EBSOA system to a web services implementation?

A: Yes.

Q48: Is it the intent of the State of Iowa to include semantics under the umbrella of data interoperability?

A: Don't understand the question.

Q49: What is the conceptual relation between the 'Proof of Concept Plan' and the 'Expansion Plan' besides being two distinct deliverables? In reading the RFP one gets the impression that in terms of content, the 'Expansion Plan' may be considered a subsection of the 'Proof of Concept' which details a subset of the EBSOA system implementation, which when implemented provides the proof-of-concept. Is this true?

A: The Proof of Concept Plan shall exercise the high-level analysis process and identify candidate services for SOA-enablement (see Q26 for the list of existing applications). The Expansion Plan shall take the Selected Option(s) and create detailed plans for implementation.

Q50: In many places, it is suggested that the Proof of Concept Plan and Expansion plan address architectures and solutions already in existence. To what extent does architecture documentation exist for networks, applications, data, process, etc.? Does the State of Iowa have a federated Enterprise Architecture in which to embed the EBSOA? Do the agencies have their own enterprise architecture?

A: Limited, depending on the agency and system. No. Yes.

Q51: What is the purpose of delaying the start of the Proof of Concept Plan until sometime during, or after the completion of EBSOA training?

A: There is no preconceived start date for any of the activities in the RFP.

Q52: Proposals are due March 2, 2006. All deliverables are due June 1, 2006. Is it the intent / goal of the State of Iowa to evaluate all proposals, sign contracts with vendor (accounting for whatever negotiations there may be), have the vendor train personal in SOA/WS, have the vendor gather data, analyze data, design a web services based SOA system customized to the Executive Branch of the State of Iowa for the Proof of Concept (all potentially after training is completed) and have the vendor identify and provides details for the expansion plan and have all of these complete in 3 months?

A: See Q12.

Q53: Does the State have a time estimate for proposal evaluation, contract agreement, and training?

A: See Q14.

Sincerely,

Ashley Super, PA III, Department of Administrative Services

General Services Enterprise, Phone: 515-281-7073, Email: ashley.super@iowa.gov

DATA SHARING BETWEEN AGENCIES VIA WEB

Reference RFP Exhibit C

Data given to other agencies				
Agency	System/application providing data	Agencies receiving/giving data	Type of data sharing	Describe the data you share
DAS	Enterprise A & A – ITE			Provides logon and account management functionality
DAS	E-payment – ITE			Handles credit card and ACH processing
DAS	Sex Offenders Web Page Print (iowasexoffenders.com) – Public Safety	All three branches receive system data?	SOAP	Iowa's data is accessible via SOAP to the national sex offender registry.
Data received from other agencies				
DPS	IDOT – Vehicle Registration	IDOT	Vehicle Registration	Data shared with law enforcement
IDR	9. On Line Access	DOT Workforce Development Human Services	On Line On Line On Line	IDR receives online access to a number of applications as indicated below: DOT - Drivers License and Vehicle Registration IWD - Wage and Employer/Employee Records DHS - Centralized Employer Registry
IWD	UI Staff, Field Staff	DOT Web	Website	Vehicle Registration
DHS	STAR Statewide Tracking and Reporting Department of Human Services	VRT (Vehicle Registration And Titling) Iowa Department of Transportation	Online Manual Access	STAR workers receive calls from citizens reporting suspected abuse. At times the only information the citizen has is a license plate number. STAR workers access the Vehicle Registration And Titling system in an effort to track names of people who are suspected of abuse.

Name	Company	Phone #	E-mail Address
Jason Jones	CISCO Inc.	225-9015	jason@ciscoinc.com
Mike McDermott	CISCO, Inc	225-9015	mike.mcdermott@ciscoinc.com
Mike Spear	CISCO, Inc.	225. 9015	Mike.Spear@Ciscoinc.com
Steve Erickson	ABC Virtual	309-6050	sericks@abcv.com
Steve Chandler	Open Technologies	251-8282	stevec@open-tech.com
Chris Driscoll	Tata Consulting Services ISG	612-964-6901	C.Driscoll@usa-tcs.com
MIKE LOCASCIO	INTEGRATED SOFTWARE SPEC CORP	847-558-5353 636-448-	MLOCASCIO@ISSTNTL.COM
MIKE TRAUSSCH	BUSINESS GROUP	3867	michael.trausch@ corpgroup.com
SHAMI DUGAL	SALEM ASSOCIATES	243-0167x118	shami.d@salemassociates.com

SIGN IN SHEET

ATTENDEES TO VENDORS CONFERENCE ON FEB 7, 2006
SOA RFP 0806005S400

Name	Company	Phone #	E-mail Address
Amy Brockjohn	IBM	515-283-2872	ajbrock@us.ibm.com
Ed Kouter	QCI	515 440 4998	ekouter@qci.com
ZIG BERZINS	TATUM	303.916.3507	ZIG. BERZINS@TATUM LLC. COM ZBERZINS@COX.NET
SANJIV GULATI	BEA	630.697.7926	gulati@bea.com
GENE HONG	BLACKWELL	312-673-5433	GMONG@BSINC.COM
Steve Wilson	Aquent	319-573-5219	Steve.Wilson@Aquent.com
MARTY KATZ	QUILOGY	515 457-2602	M.Katz@quilogy.com
Mark Steffen	WSI	515 239 9900	msteffen@winningsolutionsinc.com
Hiram Houghton	Salem Associates	515 243-0167	hiram.h@salemassociates.com
DAN COHEN	IBI	631-278-5257	DANIEL COHEN@IBI.COM
NA			
Marc Wittenberg	IBI	612 747 4402	marc-wittenberg@ibi.com
DAVID HUNT	IBI	612-961-6673	dave_hunt@iwaysoftware.com
Dawn Connet	Sogeti	515- 681-5863 681-5863	dawnconnet@argovernmentlinks.com
RFP 0806005S400 Amendment One			
Page 8 of 16			

State of Iowa Executive Branch SOA (EB-SOA)

**Vendor Conference Presentation
February 7, 2006**

STATE OF IOWA

A Brief History of EB-SOA

STATE OF IOWA

- 2004-2005: EIP Study
- 2005: TGB Formed
- Late 2005: RFP Technical Committee

EB-SOA RFP Goals

STATE OF IOWA

- Training and Mentoring
 - Agency Stakeholders (non-technical)
 - CIOs and other technical stakeholders
 - Architects
- Planning
 - Proof of Concept
 - Expansion Plan

Training & Mentoring Goals

STATE OF IOWA

- Stakeholders (technical and non-technical)
 - Understanding of SOA concepts
 - Benefits
 - Enable buy-in for the work to come
 - Prepare to facilitate SOA discussions across silos
 - Prepare to “bridge the gap” between Business and IT

Training & Mentoring Goals

STATE OF IOWA

- Architects
 - Understanding of SOA concepts
 - Detailed understanding of standards and tools
 - Understand “how to fish” for the State of Iowa
 - Develop process and practices for SOA delivery
 - Prepared for nuts & bolts SOA discussions across silos

Planning Goals

STATE OF IOWA

- Proof of Concept Plan

- Recommend best practices in data and requirements standards
- Address existing agency standards for metadata, web services
- Define processes, practices and technologies for SOA
- Learn to identify candidate processes and services
- Build an initial list of candidates for further exploration
- Work at SOA prioritization and cost/benefit analysis

Planning Goals

STATE OF IOWA

• Expansion Plan

- Detailed planning for construction and implementation
- Address and rank at least two candidate services
- Work across agencies, if possible
- Give the State a clear roadmap for initial SOA implementation
- Start the recurring process of candidate planning

EB-SOA RFP Goals

• Questions?

STATE OF IOWA